Repository structure and quick guide

Project main goal: Linking dialogue systems and dialogic teaching through a theoretical framework

Practical secondary goal: Designing a dialogue system for students to improve their oracy skills (as independent work to be able to participate in dialogic classes). The system is to help students analyze argumentative texts to acquire the cognitive and linguistic resources to begin to develop their own argumentation, also with the help of the system, in order to become better prepared for active participation in classroom debates and other dialogic tasks.

What's in the folders?

Dataset	Excel files with: • Sheet 1 features an **SAT Essay text** with each **paragraph annotated for function** • Sheet 2 **summarizes** the paragraphs annotated on Sheet 1 • Sheet 3 contains **annotated answers** to the task based on the text from Sheet 1. Answers are annotated for **error type**
Other contributions	**Theoretical framework**: Dialogue system features suggested for dialogic teaching implementation
	Argumentative task design: Design features for a concrete realization of the proposed framework
	Dialogue acts: Utterance types that could constitute the system's input and/or output
	Example conversation: Imagined conversation with the proposed system
Background information	**Answer type distribution**: Graph showing the proportion of answers assigned each label in Sheet 3 of the Excel files
	Argumentation model: Graph summarizing the argumentation model used to annotate the texts in Sheet 1 of the Excel files
	Clarification of pedagogical concepts: Explanation of what dialogic teaching and oracy skills are, as well as their importance and how technology may be used for dialogic teaching
	Clarification of technical concepts: Explanation of what dialogue systems are and what is involved in their design
	Dataset compilation: Description of the dataset compilation process. It describes what part of the proposed dialogue system is covered by the dataset, why the dataset is needed, how the argumentation model for annotating the data was developed, which textual unit was selected as the annotation unit and how labels were assigned to it, why summaries were included, which criteria were used to annotate the answer data and how the answer data was compiled, and why this is a small-scale dataset.
	Experimental tests: Discusses how the dataset was used to test a model that could predict the error types that the answers were annotated for.
	Link between the proposed task and the theoretical framework: Analyzes to which extent the proposed system is in line with the general theoretical framework we elaborated.
	References: Sources cited.